

Colliding plane waves with $W = M = 0$

B.V.Ivanov

Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy,
Tzarigradsko Shausse 72, Sofia 1784, Bulgaria

22 April 1997

Abstract

It is shown that there are three vacuum and one electrovacuum solutions of diagonal plane waves with $M = 0$ and constant Maxwell scalars. Namely, these are the single wave, Stoyanov, Babala and Bell-Szekeres solutions. A comparison is made with the planar solutions of Taub.

PACS: 04.20 Jb

1 Introduction

The line element for colliding plane waves with constant aligned polarization has the following form in the interaction region [1],[2]:

$$ds^2 = 2e^{-M}dudv - e^{-U} \left(e^V dx^2 + e^{-V} dy^2 \right) \quad (1)$$

where all metric functions depend on u and v . It is a consequence of the requirement that the Ricci, Weyl and Maxwell scalars Φ_{ij} , Ψ_i , Φ_i are the same at every point of the wave surfaces. If one requires that the metric and the Maxwell tensor $F_{\alpha\beta}$ exhibit plane symmetry, then $V = 0$ [3],[4]. We call such solutions V-solutions. The general vacuum V-solution reads [3],[5]:

$$ds^2 = (1 + Au + Bv)^{-1/2} dudv - (1 + Au + Bv) (dx^2 + dy^2) \quad (2)$$

where A , B are constants. Choosing them in different ways leads to a classification theorem for such spacetimes [6]. There are three distinct V-solutions: a trivial one, depending either on u or v (it reduces to Minkowski spacetime), Kasner's cosmological solution and the static solution of Taub. The second is also the interaction field of colliding plane shells of null dust [7]. The third may be interpreted as the gravitational field of a massive plane [8] or a domain wall [9].

The electromagnetic V-solution has been found in [10]. Like the vacuum one it is either static or cosmological and coincides with static solutions derived in different coordinates many years ago [6],[8],[11]. They represent the gravitation of massive charged planes.

In the present paper we study another simplified version of (1) when $M = 0$, calling these metrics M-solutions. They turn out to be quite similar to the V-solutions described above. For the vacuum case we prove a classification theorem, according to which there are only three M-solutions: a single wave, the Stoyanov solution with $M = 0$ [12] and the Babala solution [13]. It is shown in the Einstein-Maxwell case that the only M-solution with constant Φ_0 and Φ_2 is the Bell-Szekeres one [14].

The reason for such a drastic reduction in the number of solutions is the following. The Einstein-Maxwell equations for (1) are

$$2U_{uu} = U_u^2 + V_u^2 - 2U_u M_u + 4\Phi_2^2 \quad 2U_{vv} = U_v^2 + V_v^2 - 2U_v M_v + 4\Phi_0^2 \quad (3)$$

$$U_{uv} = U_u U_v \quad (4)$$

$$2M_{uv} = V_u V_v - U_u U_v \quad (5)$$

$$2V_{uv} = U_u V_v + U_v V_u + 4\Phi_0 \Phi_2 \quad (6)$$

$$2\Phi_{2v} = U_v\Phi_2 - V_u\Phi_0 \quad 2\Phi_{0u} = U_u\Phi_0 - V_v\Phi_2 \quad (7)$$

In the generic case (6,7) reduce to the Euler-Darboux or to the Ernst equation for V , Φ_0 , Φ_2 which have numerous solutions. M is then determined from (3) and (5) is a compatibility condition. However, when M vanishes and Φ_0, Φ_2 are constant, eq(3) determines directly V in terms of U , given by the easily integrable (4). Then (5,6,7) are additional constraints on V which make the system highly overdetermined, with just a few solutions. Similar considerations hold when $M \neq 0$ but $V = 0$.

Eqs(3-7) simplify when (1) (with $M = 0$) is written as

$$ds^2 = 2dudv - Q^2dx^2 - P^2dy^2 \quad (8)$$

$$P = e^{-\frac{U+V}{2}} \quad Q = e^{\frac{V-U}{2}} \quad (9)$$

Then (3-7) become

$$PQ_{uu} + QP_{uu} = -2QP\Phi_2^2 \quad PQ_{vv} + QP_{vv} = -2QP\Phi_0^2 \quad (10)$$

$$PQ_{uv} - QP_{uv} = 2QP\Phi_0\Phi_2 \quad PQ_{uv} + QP_{uv} = 0 \quad (11)$$

$$P_vQ_u + P_uQ_v = 0 \quad (12)$$

$$(Q\Phi_0)_u + (Q\Phi_2)_v = 0 \quad (P\Phi_2)_v - (P\Phi_0)_u = 0 \quad (13)$$

2 The vacuum case

Then $\Phi_0 = \Phi_2 = 0$ and (13) is trivial. Eq(11) with the help of (12) gives

$$P_{uv} = Q_{uv} = (QP)_{uv} = 0 \quad (14)$$

which indicates that the variables separate in P , Q and e^{-U} :

$$P = f_1(u) + g_1(v) \quad Q = f_2(u) + g_2(v) \quad (15)$$

$$e^{-U} = f(u) + g(v) \quad (16)$$

Eq(16) is in fact (4). Eq(15) shows that for M-solutions the same property is shared also by the square roots of the metric components. The main equation now becomes (12):

$$g_{1v}f_{2u} = -f_{1u}g_{2v} \quad (17)$$

and in addition (10) must be satisfied. There are two alternatives:

1) Suppose some of the factors in (17) vanish. There are four possible cases.

a) $f_{1u} = f_{2u} = 0$

Then $f_{1,2}$ are constants and $P(v)$, $Q(v)$ satisfy the corresponding equation in (10). We have a single wave approaching from the right and no interaction.

b) $g_{1v} = g_{2v} = 0$

Then $P(u)$, $Q(u)$ represent a single wave approaching from the left.

c) $f_{1u} = g_{1v} = 0$

In this case P is constant and from (10) we see that Q is linear:

$$Q = c_1 + c_2 u + c_3 v \quad (18)$$

Rescaling u and v we can set $c_i = \pm 1$. A constant M appears in (8). This is allowed because M-solutions may include also solutions with constant M since only the derivatives of M enter (3-7). Having in mind that $\sqrt{2}u = t - z$, $\sqrt{2}v = t + z$ the signs of c_2 and c_3 should be kept the same in order to preserve the time-like character of t . Thus we obtain the solution

$$Q = 1 \pm u \pm v \quad P = 1 \quad (19)$$

This is the Stoyanov solution [2],[12]

$$ds^2 = 2(1 \pm u \pm v)^{\frac{a^2-1}{2}} dudv - (1 \pm u \pm v)^{1-a} dx^2 - (1 \pm u \pm v)^{1+a} dy^2 \quad (20)$$

with $a = -1$ and $M = 0$. The linear terms in e^{-U} cause the appearance of impulsive components of the matter-energy tensor at the boundary of the interaction region. Plus signs in (20) lead to negative energy, minus signs - to the usual curvature singularity. The line element (20) may be transformed to the cosmological Kasner metric [15].

d) $f_{2u} = g_{2v} = 0$

Now Q is constant while P is linear. Therefore

$$Q = 1 \quad P = 1 \pm u \pm v \quad (21)$$

which is (20) with $a = 1$. Again we get a Stoyanov-Kasner solution.

2) Suppose none of the four factors in (17) vanishes. Then

$$\frac{g_{1v}}{g_{2v}} = -\frac{f_{1u}}{f_{2u}} = c \neq 0 \quad (22)$$

$$f_1 = -cf_2 + c_4 \quad g_1 = cg_2 + c_5 \quad (23)$$

Replacing (23) in (10) gives

$$(f_1 + g_1) f_{2uu} = c(f_2 + g_2) f_{2uu} \quad (f_1 + g_1) g_{2vv} = -c(f_2 + g_2) g_{2vv} \quad (24)$$

We shall prove that $f_{2uu} = g_{2uu} = 0$ and consequently $f_{1uu} = g_{1vv} = 0$. When both f_{2uu} and g_{2uu} do not vanish the contradiction $P = 0$ follows from (24). Suppose that $f_{2uu} = 0$, $g_{2uu} \neq 0$. Eq(24) shows that $g_2(v)$ is constant i.e. a contradiction. The result is similar in the other possible case. Hence $P_{uu} = Q_{vv} = 0$ and following the argument after (18) we end with

$$Q = 1 - u + v \quad P = 1 - u - v \quad (25)$$

This is the solution of Babala [13] which describes the collision of a plane impulsive gravitational wave with a plane shell of null matter. One can check from (19,21,25) that (16) holds in all cases.

Thus we have proven the theorem stated in the introduction as far as the vacuum case is concerned.

3 The Einstein-Maxwell case

Now we put $\Phi_0 = b$, $\Phi_2 = a$ and (13) becomes

$$aP_v = bP_u \quad aQ_v = -bQ_u \quad (26)$$

Similar condition is found in [10] and the same reasoning leads to the functional dependence $P = P(au + bv)$, $Q = Q(au - bv)$. Equations (10-13) reduce to

$$Q'' = -Q \quad P'' = -P \quad (27)$$

where the differentiation is with respect to the corresponding argument. Taking into account the usual boundary conditions for colliding plane waves we find

$$Q = \cos(au - bv) \quad P = \cos(au + bv) \quad (28)$$

This is the well-known Bell-Szekeres solution [14] , describing the collision of two step electromagnetic waves. This ends the complete proof of the theorem.

4 Discussion

There is an obvious analogy between V-solutions and M-solutions. The single wave spacetimes correspond to each other, the Stoyanov-Kasner solution is an analog of the Dray-'t Hooft-Kasner solution, the Babala spacetime corresponds to the Taub static spacetime and finally, the Bell-Szekeres solution is an analog of the Kar-McVittie solution [11].

The difference is that the Taub and Kar-McVittie solutions are not interpretable as colliding plane waves. They depend on z while in the Babala and Bell-Szekeres solutions (with $a = b$) one metric component depends on z the other on t and these metrics are not static but resemble a peculiar kind of standing wave. Their topological structure is very similar as noticed in [2] which probably is due to the fact that they both fall in a very restricted class of solutions.

The non-trivial Weyl scalars for (1) are Ψ_0 , Ψ_2 , Ψ_4 . For V-solutions $\Psi_0 = \Psi_4 = 0$ because their terms are proportional to derivatives of V . Consequently, these solutions are not coupled to gravitational waves but at most to planes of null-matter [7]. For M-solutions

$$\Psi_0 = -\frac{1}{2QP} (PQ_{vv} - QP_{vv}) \quad \Psi_4 = -\frac{1}{2QP} (PQ_{uu} - QP_{uu}) \quad (29)$$

$$\Psi_2 = \frac{1}{2}M_{uv} = 0 \quad (30)$$

which makes them complementary to the V-solutions. However, one can check that for all M-solutions $\Psi_0 = \Psi_4 = 0$ in the interaction region, so they are conformally flat. The gravitational waves when present have impulsive nature.

Finally, it should be mentioned that other M-solutions exist when $W \neq 0$ or the energy-momentum tensor includes different fields. Such is the case of the

generalized Bell-Szekeres solution [2] or the collision of classical neutrino waves [16].

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by the Bulgarian National Fund for Scientific Research under contract F-632.

References

- [1] P.Szekeres, J.Math.Phys. **13**, 286 (1972)
- [2] J.B.Griffiths, *Colliding Plane Waves in General Relativity* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1991)
- [3] A.H.Taub, Ann.Math. **53**, 472 (1951)
- [4] S.Patnaik, Proc.Camb.Phil.Soc. **67**, 127 (1970)
- [5] A.H.Taub, J.Math.Phys. **29**, 690 (1988)
- [6] D.Kramer, H.Stephani, E.Herlt and M.MacCallum, *Exact Solutions of Einstein's Field Equations* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1980)
- [7] T.Dray and G. 't Hooft, Class.Quantum Grav. **3**, 825 (1986)
- [8] P.A.Amundsen and Ø.Grøn, Phys.Rev.D **27**, 1731 (1983)
- [9] J.Lemos and O.S.Ventura, J.Math.Phys. **35**, 3604 (1994)
- [10] P.S.Letelier and R.R.Tabensky, J.Math.Phys. **15**, 594 (1974)
- [11] C.Kar, Phys.Z. **27**, 208 (1926)
G.C.McVittie, Proc.R.Soc.London **124**, 366 (1929)
- [12] B.J.Stoyanov, Phys.Rev.D **20**, 2469 (1979)
- [13] D.Babala, Class.Quantum Grav. **4**, L89 (1987)
- [14] P.Bell and P.Szekeres, Gen.Rel.Grav. **5**, 275 (1974)
- [15] Y.Nutku, Phys.Rev.D **24**, 1040 (1981)
- [16] J.B.Griffiths, J.Phys.A **9**, 45 (1976)